## DETAILED ACTION

1.      This Office Action is in response to an AMENDMENT entered 08/12/2011.

2.      The Non-Final Office Action of 05/19/2011 is fully incorporated into this Final Office Action by reference.

### *Status of Claims*

3.      Claims 1-34, 36-70 and 72-86 are pending in this application.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.      Claims 1-2, 4-9, 24, 28, 31-32, 34, 36-38, 50, 55, 58, 61, 64, 66-70, 72-73 and 81 are  rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakata et al (US 2006/0271993).


            Regarding claims 1, 31, 64 and 81, Nakata discloses a communication system (FIG.1, 1) having a plurality of clients including a first client and a second client (FIG.1, 3A, 3B), a method for providing continuity of at least one broadcast event between the plurality of clients (FIG.1, 3A, 3B) comprising:

            monitoring the at least one broadcast event by the first client (e.g., see Para 74 lines 1-8; Para 75 lines 1-6; Para 111 lines 4-11), and

            launching monitoring of the at least one broadcast event by the second client in response to an occurrence associated with the at least one broadcast event to transfer the monitoring of

the at least one broadcast event from the first client to the second client (e.g., see Para 79 lines 4-7; Para 82 lines 1-6; Para 83 lines 1-6; Para 86 lines 5-10; Para 113; transferring the monitoring of a program from a living room to a bedroom),

wherein the communication system (1) comprises a first system (monitor device 3A in one room such as living room connected to the optical disk device through the network I/F as the first system) and a second system (monitor device 3B in another room such as bed room connected to the optical disk device through the network I/F as the second system), wherein the first client device (3A) operates within the first system and the second client device (3B) operates within the second system (each client device operating in a different room is interpreted as operating in a separate system).

Even though the same communication interface such as IEEE 1394 may be used for each client device at different room as shown in FIG.1; however, in a separate embodiment, Nakata also discloses the device interconnection might not be limited to IEEE1394 interface, a diversity of serial and parallel interfaces and further in a variety of wire or wireless communication network are also used (Para 112).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to also include a diversity of serial and parallel interfaces and further in a variety of wire or wireless communication network, as taught by Nakata to provide a more diversified system so more communication coverage with different interfaces/protocol can be accommodated.

Regarding claims 2 and 32, Nakata further discloses disabling monitoring of the at least one broadcast event by the first client (refer but not limited to Para 81 lines 1-4).

Regarding claims 4, 34 and 66, Nakata further discloses one or a combination of broadcast events selected from a group consisting of a sports game, a simulcast concert, a

television program (refer but not limited to Para 111 lines 5-9), a networked program, and a radio program.

Regarding claims 5, 58 and 67, Nakata further discloses the occurrence comprising one or a combination of occurrences selected from a group consisting of an event start time, a user input received by the first client, a user input received by the second client (refer but not limited to Para 82 lines 1-6), a deactivation of the first client, an activation of the second client, and an establishment of a communication connection between the first client and the second client.

Regarding claims 6 and 68, Nakata further discloses the first client operating within a first device (FIG.1, 3A) and further wherein the second client operating within a second device (FIG.1, 3B).

Regarding claims 7, 36, 69, and 72, Nakata further discloses the first device is a device selected from a group consisting of a network device (FIG.1, 3A), a mobile device, and a cable box.

Regarding claims 8, 37, 70 and 73, Nakata further discloses the second device is a device selected from a group consisting of a network device (FIG.1, 3B), a mobile device, and a cable box.

Regarding claims 9, 38 and 61, Nakata further discloses initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer prior to the launching step (refer but not limited to Para 77 lines 1-6; Para 79 lines 4-7).

Regarding claims 24 and 50, Nakata further discloses the occurrence comprises:

sending a monitoring notification from the first client to the second client (refer but not limited to Para 77; Para 78).


Regarding claims 28 and 55, Nakata further discloses the occurrence comprises:

sending a monitoring notification from the second client to the first client (FIG.1, 3A, 3B are identical set-up, the operation between them are identical, this includes sending a monitoring notification from 3B to 3A).


5.      Claims 3, 33 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakata et al (US 2006/0271993) as applied in claims 1, 31 and 64 above, and further in view of Russell et al (US 2002/0049679).


Regarding claims 3, 33 and 65, Nakata discloses all the limitations as in claims 1, 31 and 64 above.

Nakata is silent about transferring a monitoring license from the first client to the second client prior to the launching step.

In an analogous art, Russell teaches transferring a monitoring license from the first client to the second client prior to the launching step (refer but not limited to Para 67 lines 1-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include transferring a monitoring license from one client to another client prior to the launching step, as taught by Russell so that a licensed copy can be better protected.


6.      Claims 10-23, 25-27, 29-30, 39-49, 51-54, 56-57, 59-60, 74-80, 82-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakata et al (US 2006/0271993) as applied in claims 1, 9, 24, 28, 31, 38, 50, 55, 64, 68, 78, 82 above, and further in view of Finseth et al (US 2005/0028207).

Regarding Claims 10, 74 and 82, Nakata discloses all the limitations as in Claims 1, 9, 64, 68 and 81 above.

Nakata is silent about storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes choosing the second client from the stored at least one transfer client profile.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step (FIG.7; Para 81 lines 1-6), wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes choosing the second client from the stored at least one transfer client profile (Para 81 lines 9-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes choosing the second client from the stored at least one transfer client profile, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claims 11, 75 and 83, Nakata discloses all the limitations in Claims 1, 9, 64, 68 and 81.

Nakata is silent about storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients including a second client profile associated with the second client in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step; and

linking the second client profile with the at least one broadcast event, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the at least one broadcast event.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients including a second client profile associated with the second client in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step (FIG.9, 174, Para 92 lines 3-10); and linking the second client profile with the at least one broadcast event, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the at least one broadcast event (Para 92 lines 11-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients including a second client profile associated with the second client in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step; and linking the second client profile with the at least one broadcast event, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the at least one broadcast event, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.


Regarding Claims 12, 76 and 84, Nakata discloses all the limitations in Claims 1, 9, 64, 68 and 81.

Nakata is silent about storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients including a second client profile associated with the second client in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step; and linking the second client profile with a broadcast channel, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes identifying the broadcast channel associated with the at least one broadcast event, and retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the at least one broadcast channel.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients including a second client profile associated with the second client in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step; and linking the second client profile with a broadcast channel, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes:

identifying the broadcast channel associated with the at least one broadcast event (Para 84 lines 1-3), and

retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the at least one broadcast channel (Para 84 lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients including a second client profile associated with the second client in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step; and linking the second client profile with a broadcast channel, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step including identifying the broadcast channel associated with the at least one broadcast event; and retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the at least one broadcast channel, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.


Regarding Claims 13, 77 and 85, Nakata discloses all the limitations as in Claims 1, 9, 64, 68 and 81 above.

Nakata is silent about linking the second client profile with a time period, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes:

identifying the time period associated with the at least one broadcast event; and

retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the time period.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches linking the second client profile with a time period (FIG.12, 206), wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes:

identifying the time period associated with the at least one broadcast event (FIG.12, 206);

and retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the time period (FIG.12, 208, Para

96 lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include linking the second client profile with a

time period, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step including identifying the

time period associated with the at least one broadcast event; and retrieving from storage the

second client profile linked to the time period, as taught by Finseth so that more information

regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claims 14, 39, 78 and 86, Nakata discloses all the limitations in Claims 1, 9,

64, 68 and 81. Nakata further discloses sending a monitoring notification from the first client to

the second client, wherein the monitoring notification includes a broadcast channel identifier

(Para 111 lines 8-13).

Nakata is silent about sending a request for a plurality of broadcast information

associated with the at least one broadcast event from the second client to the broadcast server;

and receiving the plurality of broadcast information from the broadcast server by the second

client.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches sending a request for a plurality of broadcast

information associated with the at least one broadcast event from the second client to the

broadcast server (Para 84 lines 1-5); and receiving the plurality of broadcast information from the

broadcast server by the second client (Para 84 lines 1-5, building his/her own program guide

requires requesting and receiving broadcast information from the broadcast server).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include sending a request for a plurality of

broadcast information associated with the at least one broadcast event from the second client to

the broadcast server; and receiving the plurality of broadcast information from the broadcast

server by the second client, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claim 15, the claim is met by Nakata and Finseth. In particular, Finseth discloses the monitoring notification including a time stamp (Para 82 lines 1-5, transmission through the internet includes the time stamp).

Regarding Claims 16, 19, 22, 26, 40, 47, 52 and 79, Finseth further discloses one or a combination of broadcast information selected from a group consisting of an event start time, an event end time, a plurality of event connection information, and a plurality of media information (refer but not limited to FIG.4, 94; Para 81 lines 3-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include at least an event start time and an event end time for broadcast information so as to comply with program guide standard for digital broadcasting such as MPEG.

Regarding Claims 17, 20, 23, 27, 41, 44, 48, 53 and 80, Finseth further discloses the plurality of media information including a plurality of canned content information (refer but not limited to FIG.4, 106; Para 84 lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a plurality of canned content information to accommodate various viewing needs for the users.

Regarding Claims 18 and 43, Nakata discloses all the limitations as in Claims 1, 9, 31 and 38 above.

Nakata is silent about sending a request for a plurality of broadcast information associated with the at least one broadcast event from the first client to the broadcast server;

receiving the plurality of broadcast information from the broadcast server by the first

client; and sending a monitoring notification from the first client to the second client, wherein

the monitoring notification includes the plurality of broadcast information.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches sending a request for a plurality of broadcast

information associated with the at least one broadcast event from the first client to the broadcast

server;receiving the plurality of broadcast information from the broadcast server by the first client

(FIG.4, 88A, Para 64 lines 7-12, Para 70 lines 1-5); and sending a monitoring notification from the

first client to the second client, wherein the monitoring notification includes the plurality of

broadcast information (Para 80).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include sending a request for a plurality of

broadcast information associated with the at least one broadcast event from the first client to the

broadcast server; receiving the plurality of broadcast information from the broadcast server by the

first client; and sending a monitoring notification from the first client to the second client, wherein

the monitoring notification includes the plurality of broadcast information taught by Finseth so that

more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.


Regarding Claims 21, 29, 46 and 56, Nakata does disclose all the limitations in Claims 1,

9, 28, 31, and 55. Nakata further discloses sending a monitoring notification from the first client to

the second client (Para 111 lines 8-13).

Nakata is silent about requesting a plurality of broadcast information by the second client

prior to the launching step in response to the monitoring notification; and sending the plurality of

broadcast information from the first client to the second client in response to the requesting step.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches requesting a plurality of broadcast information by

the second client prior to the launching step in response to the monitoring notification (Para 91

lines 1-3, in order to view the program guide, viewer needs to request, like using remote control);

and sending the plurality of broadcast information from the first client to the second client in

response to the requesting step (Para 91 lines 1-7, per user's request, server sending the

program guide to the receiver).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include requesting a plurality of broadcast

information by the second client prior to the launching step in response to the monitoring

notification; and sending the plurality of broadcast information from the first client to the second

client in response to the requesting step, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding

broadcast program can be shared.


Regarding Claims 25 and 51, Nakata discloses all the limitations as in Claims 1, 24, 31,

and 50 above.

Nakata is silent about the monitoring notification including a plurality of broadcast

information.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches the monitoring notification including a plurality of

broadcast information (FIG.4, 94).

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include the monitoring notification

including a plurality of broadcast information, as taught by Finseth so that more information

regarding broadcast program can be shared.


Regarding Claims 30 and 57, Nakata discloses all the limitations as in Claims 1, 28, 31,

and 55.

Nakata is silent about the monitoring notification including a second client profile.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches the monitoring notification including a second client profile (FIG.9, 176A).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include the monitoring notification including a second client profile, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claim 42, Finseth further discloses a plurality of canned content information is associated with the at least one broadcast event (FIG.4, 106), the method further comprising determining the plurality of canned content information by the second device in response to the receiving of the plurality of broadcast information step (FIG.7, 140, Para 84, lines 1-5).

Regarding Claims 45, 49 and 54, Finseth further discloses receiving the monitoring notification including the plurality of broadcast information by the second transfer application operating within the second device (FIG.7, 138, Para 83); and determining the plurality of canned content information by the second device in response to the receiving of the monitoring notification including the plurality of broadcast information step (FIG.7, 140, Para 84).

Regarding Claim 59, Nakata discloses all the limitations in Claim 31.

Nakata is silent about downloading an event monitoring application by the second device prior to the launching step.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches downloading an event monitoring application by the second device prior to the launching step (Para 84, build a personal program guide based on the information from first device).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include downloading an event monitoring application by the second device prior to the launching step, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claim 60, Finseth further discloses receiving a navigational path from the first device by the second device prior to the downloading step (the shared viewing preference information from 1$^{st}$ device to the 2$^{nd}$ device is a navigational path), wherein the downloading step comprising downloading the event monitoring application using the navigational path (Para 84 lines 1-7).

7.    Claims 62 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakata et al (US 2006/0271993) in view of Finseth et al (US 2005/0028207).

Regarding Claim 62, Nakata discloses within a communication system (FIG.1, 1, Para 111 lines 4-8) having a plurality of devices including a first device (FIG.1, 3A) and a second device (FIG.1, 3B), a method for providing continuity of at least one broadcast event between the plurality of devices comprising:

monitoring the at least one broadcast event by a first client on the first device (FIG.1, 3A) ; transferring a plurality of broadcast information associated with the at least one broadcast event from the first device to the second device (Para 111 lines 4-13);

wherein the communication system (1) comprises a first system (monitor device 3A in one room such as living room connected to the optical disk device through the network I/F as the first system) and a second system (monitor device 3B in another room such as bed room connected to the optical disk device through the network I/F as the second system), wherein the

first device (3A) operates within the first system and the second device (3B) operates within the second system;

The amended limitations of "wherein the first system and the second system are different" have been addressed as in Claims 1, 31, 64 and 81.

Nakata is silent about sending the plurality of broadcast information from the second device to the third device in response to an occurrence associated with the at least one broadcast event; and

launching monitoring of the at least one broadcast event by a third client on the third device in response receiving the plurality of broadcast information sent from the second device.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches monitoring of the at least one broadcast event by a third client on the third device in response receiving the plurality of broadcast information sent from the second device (Para 87 lines 1-14, server is the 2$^{nd}$ client, the remaining group members is the 3$^{rd}$ client).

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include monitoring of the at least one broadcast event by a third client on the third device in response receiving the plurality of broadcast information sent from the second device, as taught by Finseth so more viewers can share the broadcast information.


Regarding Claim 63, Nakata further discloses **the occurrence comprising** <u>one</u> or a combination of occurrences selected from a group consisting of an event start time, **a user input received by the first device** (e.g., see Para 77 lines 1-6), a user input received by the second device, a user input received by the third device, a detection of movement of the third device, a deactivation of the first device, a deactivation of the first client, an activation of the third device, an activation of a first transfer application operating within the first device, an activation of a second transfer application operating within the second device, an activation of a third transfer application

operating within the third device, an establishment of a communication connection between the

first device and the second device, and an establishment of a communication connection

between the second device and the third device.


## *Response to Arguments*

8.　　Applicant's arguments filed 08/12/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In reference to Applicant's arguments

In teaching a single bus, Nakata teaches away from Applicant's invention. Paragraph

[0112] of Nakata does nothing to correct the teaching away. Paragraph [0112] merely states that

different types of serial connections or parallel connections could be made with the singular bus,

and that the singular bus could be wired or wireless. Nothing in paragraph [0112] suggests that

multiple busses or multiple communication systems can be used. The inclusion of paragraph

[0112] in Nakata's disclosure provides no teaching whatsoever of transferring monitoring between

different systems. All embodiments of Nakata still require a single bus in a single system. Nothing

in paragraph [0112] provides a teaching of why this would not be the case.

Examiner's response

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As an alternative embodiment, Nakata discloses

the interconnected devices in the AV system are not limited to IEEE1394 interface. Nakata further

discloses the invention also includes applications in a system that may be constructed of I/O

devices using a diversity of serial or parallel interfaces, and further in a variety of wire or wireless

communication networks (see Para 112). Since various interfaces (e.g., serial or parallel, other

than IEEE1394) for connections from a system (e.g., IEEE1394) or connected to a variety of wire

or wireless communication networks (external to IEEE 1394 network) can be reasonably

interpreted as communicating between two different systems (IEEE1394 vs. non-IEEE1394 or

wire vs. wireless); thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include transferring monitoring between two different systems so as to

accommodate different standards or protocols for more coverage.

## Conclusion

9.      Claims 1-34, 36-70 and 72-86 are rejected.

**10.     THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

## Correspondence Information

11.     Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRED PENG whose telephone number is (571)270-1147. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 09:30-19:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hirl can be reached on (571) 272-3685. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative

or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-

1000.

/Fred Peng/

Examiner, Art Unit 2426


/JOSEPH P. HIRL/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2426

October 21, 2011